

## Giving and receiving advice in computer-mediated peer response activities

*Mei-Hsing Tsai and Celeste Kinginger*

### Abstract

*In synchronous computer-mediated contexts, peer-to-peer interaction at the micro-level has received little scrutiny.<sup>1</sup> In applying a conversation analysis approach, this study scrutinizes the precise nature of peer-to-peer advice giving and receiving. In this process, an advice giver can be viewed at certain moments as more competent to evaluate a recipient's essay and to provide advice, while the recipient can be positioned as being less knowledgeable. Therefore, the present study focuses on the following research question: How did advice givers and recipients manage the asymmetrical participant roles inherent in L2 peer response? More specifically, this study explores the relationship between institutional roles and social relationships during advising episodes by investigating three single cases of dyadic pairs in an ESL university writing classroom. We show the ambiguity arising in interactions as novice advice givers attempt to balance criticism with the maintenance of harmonious interpersonal relationships, offering compliments rather than straightforward advice.*

**KEYWORDS:** ADVICE AND SUGGESTIONS; CONVERSATION ANALYSIS; L2 PEER RESPONSE; POLITENESS STRATEGIES; TEXT-BASED COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION

---

### Affiliation

National Tsing Hua University, Taiwan.  
email: meih112@gmail.com (corresponding author)

## Introduction

The current study explores a particular aspect of L2 peer review – advice giving and receiving – as it takes place during computer-mediated interaction in an ESL classroom. Unlike other dyads in educational contexts where institutional relationships are relatively clear-cut (e.g., professor-student or tutor-tutee), the institutional roles of advice givers and recipients in L2 peer review activities are relatively fluid. Peer response is a reciprocal activity where each participant takes turns as an advice giver and recipient while, at the same time, maintaining social solidarity with peers. However, peer review activity can offer asymmetrical participant roles. Hutchby (1995) pointed out a distinctive and fundamental characteristic of advice-giving because an advice giver may presuppose ‘some deficit in the knowledge state of recipient, advice-giving is an activity which assumes or establishes an asymmetry between participants’ (p. 221). In other words, during advice giving episodes, the advice giver can be momentarily construed as more knowledgeable than his or her peer, providing critique, suggestions or directives, while the recipient can be positioned as less competent (Hutchby, 1995).<sup>2</sup>

In L2 peer review activities, the role of advice giver offers the participant greater institutional power to make evaluative assessment and provide advice at the moment of interaction. These relatively asymmetrical roles may cause peer review interactions to become what Brown and Levinson (1987) termed face-threatening acts (FTAs), threatening participants’ negative face (the right to non-imposition) and positive face (the need to have a positive self-image). L2 speakers may employ different interactive strategies to mitigate FTAs and to maintain or establish social solidarity in peer review sessions. Employing conversation analysis, we explore the specific features of advice giving and receiving in the SCMC setting, while also showing how peer responders balance institutional roles and maintenance of interpersonal relationships.

L2 peer review activities in this study are considered institutional practices;<sup>3</sup> that is, ‘participants’ institutional or professional identities are somehow made relevant to the work activities in which they are engaged’ (Drew and Heritage, 1992: 3). L2 peer response can be defined as institutional in several respects. First, it is goal-oriented: ESL students conduct peer review activities with specific goals pertaining to the enhancement of their drafts (Liu and Hansen, 2002). In addition, special restrictions can exist as to what is treated as an allowable contribution to the task at hand. That is, even if the participants might engage in some social talk, the institutional talk, advice giving and receiving, is often the dominant feature of peer response interaction. Finally, inferential frameworks and procedures particular to the L2 peer review context may operate. For example, questions generally viewed as information-seeking in everyday conversations may be interpreted to be facilitative in doing advising.<sup>4</sup>

## Theoretical framework

### The use of Synchronous Computer Mediated Communication (SCMC) for L2 peer interactions

Synchronous online peer response has become an attractive alternative to face-to-face communication in L2 writing classrooms. Previous research has discovered that discourse functions in SCMC are similar to those characterizing face-to-face communication. Social functions such as clarification requests, disagreement or agreement statements, social formulations, and topic management are prevalent in synchronous online peer interactions (Blake, 2000; Smith, 2003; Sotillo, 2000). However, SCMC also has many unique characteristics that shape participation structures and L2 speakers' use of communicative strategies. Due to the lack of aural and visual paralinguistic cues in SCMC contexts, participants extensively use electronic devices and communicative strategies to manage conversations and to express their identities and roles (e.g., Negretti, 1999). In addition, SCMC turn-taking includes many more overlaps than does face-to-face communication because participants can contribute to the discussion simultaneously. This overlapping allows multiple parallel threads but does not imply competition for the conversational floor (Simpson, 2005; Smith, 2003). L2 speakers are also more likely to have balanced participation and control of discourse in SCMC contexts as opposed to face-to-face conversation (e.g., Beauvois, 1992, 1998; Chun, 1994; Fitze, 2006; Kinginger, 2000; Warschauer, 1996). Thus, many studies in L2 classrooms have shown that the use of SCMC enhances opportunities and motivation for meaningful negotiation and authentic interaction (Kern, 1995). Further, it generates more interaction while reducing anxiety (e.g., Kelm, 1992; Warschauer, 1996). Additionally, SCMC as written communication affords L2 users more time to construct their ideas, and opportunities to reread previous messages, which may lead to better communication (Chapelle, 2001). Due to these advantages, SCMC peer review tasks have become common within L2 university writing classes (see Liang, 2010; Liu and Sadler, 2003).

Although L2 composition studies have explored the nature of SCMC L2 peer review interaction (e.g., DiGiovanni and Nagaswami, 2001; Liang, 2010), relatively few studies address advice giving and receiving in L2 computer-mediated peer revision contexts. Since advice giving and receiving is one of the main pedagogical purposes in the peer review activity, it is important to understand how L2 users manage this process. The present study explores the nature of L2 SCMC peer-to-peer advice from a conversation analytic perspective. Three domains of research are related to the current project: (a) studies concerned with the nature of interaction occurring in L2 SCMC peer revision-related sessions; (b) research addressing the situated practice of advice giving and receiving in a variety of contexts; and (c) literature focusing on the use of

politeness strategies in advice giving and receiving. In the following literature review section, we will discuss these three strands of research.

### **SCMC peer revision-related interactions**

Synchronous computer-mediated research on L2 writing is primarily interested in two research areas: the differences in nature of comments produced by advice givers between two communicative modes (i.e., SCMC and face-to-face), and the characteristics of interactional patterns in SCMC peer revision-related activities. The first line of studies focuses on the nature of peer comments and examines the quality of online peer review (e.g., Braine, 1997; Liu and Sadler, 2003). For example, Liu and Sadler (2003) scrutinized the distribution of peer comments in different areas (i.e., global and local) and categories (i.e., revision-related and non-revision-related) by comparing SCMC to communication in face-to-face groups. They found that both groups focused on global comments; however, the SCMC group produced more revision-related, and therefore pedagogically relevant discourse than did the face-to-face group.

The second strand of research developed different categories of speech functions to describe the nature of peer revision-related interactions in SCMC and compare it to that of face-to-face communication. For example, in applying Halliday's (1994) functional-semantic analysis, Jones *et al.* (2006) investigated two types of conversational moves in face-to-face and SCMC modes of peer tutoring sessions at a university writing center: initiating moves and responding moves. In face-to-face sessions, peer tutors controlled the interaction by producing four times more initiating moves, while tutees made twice as many responding moves. In online interaction, tutees produced more initiating moves to inquire about information and to elicit explanations and evaluations, leading to more equitable participation.

Since SCMC revision-related peer discourse is dynamic and includes various interactional characteristics, L2 researchers have become interested in SCMC interaction itself and have focused primarily on investigating negotiation, discussion, correction, and other interactional moves. For example, Liang (2010) investigated SCMC interactions in three groups of L2 speakers' revision-related and non-revision-related discourse in two different writing tasks. Liang described four types of negotiations for online revision-related activities (i.e., meaning negotiation, content discussion, error correction and task management), and two categories (i.e., social talk and technical action) for online non-revision-related speech functions. Liang found that L2 speakers produced similar amounts of revision-related and non-revision related discourses across different groups and writing tasks. In addition, L2 speakers tended to focus more on content discussion and task management than on meaning negotiation and error correction in SCMC revision communications.

## Advice giving and receiving

A number of studies address the situated practice of advice giving and receiving in a variety of contexts, for instance, between nurses and patients (Heritage and Sefi, 1992), on a call-in radio program (Pudlinski, 2002), on an online discussion forum (Morrow, 2006) between university professors and graduate students (Vehviläinen, 2009) and between L1 tutors and L2 tutees (Waring, 2005, 2007a, 2007b). Advice giving and receiving activities may establish asymmetry between the participants (Hutchby, 1995). Asymmetry in institutional discourse is related to the power of institutional agents to shape participation opportunities and to define the outcome of encounters (Hutchby and Wooffit, 2008). Thus, these studies seek to understand connections between status and relative discursive rights. For example, the conversation analytic analyses of doctor-patient interaction show that the doctor as a health advice giver can determine the topics to be discussed and define the upshots of discussions (Frankel, 1990; Heath, 1992). Similarly, in L2 peer revision-related interaction, the advice giver often has authority to direct the topics by addressing the recipient's texts, and then typically provides straightforward advice on language issues (Waring, 2005, 2007b). Additionally, strong prescriptive forms exist in advice giving such as modal verbs of obligation (e.g., should).

On the other hand, the advice recipient is constituted as *less-knowing* and has statutory rights to seek advice. Requesting advice can be viewed as recipients' routinely-done and legitimate business (Vehviläinen, 2009). For example, Vehviläinen (2009) identified two formats of students' advice-seeking questions in academic supervision. In the first, students seek straightforward advice on their problems by using open-ended questions. These questions invoke students' incompetence, but testify to their attempts to solve the problem, thereby legitimizing advice requests. The second appears to be polar questions or statements that involve candidate solutions to problems. This format can show students' knowledge of the issues, and they receive advice in the expanded form; that is, in addition to minimal confirmations or disconfirmations, in this case teachers offer grounds and accounts for their responses. Findings on these formats offer a crucial point of reference for understanding advice-seeking requests in L2 peer review sessions.

## Politeness strategies in the process of advising

Other research focuses on politeness strategies in advice giving and receiving episodes (e.g., Golato, 2005; Pomerantz, 1984; Stewart, 2004). In L2 peer response processes, an advice giver can be viewed as having higher status, his or her institutionally-given power being indexed by the process of evaluating

the recipient's essay. Simultaneously, a recipient can be positioned as having subordinate status, given the role of requesting advice. These asymmetrically institutional roles can cause L2 peer review to become a globally face-threatening activity, threatening participants' negative and positive faces. Additionally, L2 dyadic peer review is a reciprocal activity where the roles of advice givers and recipients are routinely exchanged. This type of relationship is not like other institutional relationships in which advice givers and recipients have relatively clear-cut statuses and may lead to the need to maintain or establish social solidarity between the parties. Thus, L2 speakers may adopt politeness strategies to mitigate FTAs and to display or sustain solidarity during peer review sessions.

Recipients can maintain a harmonious relationship with advice givers by agreeing on negative evaluations or accepting advice. In fact, agreements or acceptances are preferred actions turn shapes, functioning to minimize threats to advice givers' positive face, maintain social solidarity and avoid conflicts (Heritage, 1984: 265). These preferred actions (e.g., agreement or acceptance) are produced straightforwardly and without delay, while 'unpreferred' actions are performed with delay and accounts (Pomerantz, 1984). For example, in peer revision-related contexts, because the tutee seeks advice from the tutor, advice acceptance can be viewed as the preferred and unnoticed action, while rejection or resistance can be noticeable and unpreferred (Waring, 2007a).

On the other hand, doing-advising may particularly threaten both the positive and the negative face of recipients. More specifically, negative evaluations of the recipient's performance potentially threaten positive face; at the same time, suggestions for changes may damage the recipient's negative face (Vásquez, 2004). Therefore, the advice giver is likely to use a number of politeness strategies to remedy FTAs in peer revision-related interactions. For example, Waring (2007b) illustrated tutors' use of accounts (i.e., the explanations for problems) in giving advice during peer tutoring sessions. Waring found that accounts are used to remedy the FTA of advice giving by allowing participants to infer solutions together and to protect the face of the recipients.

Of those face-saving strategies, the compliment is a frequent and crucial politeness strategy to delicately mitigate FTAs and to maintain rapport (e.g., Golato, 2005; Johnson, 1992; Stewart, 2004). Compliments can be used to address both ideational goals and interpersonal social purposes in peer revision-related discourse (Johnson, 1992). They are ideational because complimenting discourse expresses cognitive judgments and positive perceptions. In the meanwhile, they are interpersonal since compliments emphasize the interlocutor's positive self-image. Johnson (1992) asserts that one of the major purposes of compliments is to please the addressee. She states:

Complimenting is viewed here as expressing a positive judgment which applies only to the person addressed. However, praising the paper (an object), for example, counts as complementing the addressee (a person) in this context because it attributes credit to the addressee as author of the paper. That is, by saying something good about the paper, the speaker is saying something good about the addressee. (p. 55)

A compliment functions as a kind of *social accelerator*, which refers to a desire to maintain social solidarity (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 101). In peer revision-related contexts, an important function of compliments is to redress FTAs. Criticism and advice for improvement constitute FTAs, while a compliment that enhances the recipient's positive image can soften the force of those same FTAs (Johnson, 1992; Stewart, 2004). More recently, Stewart (2004) found that when tutors felt less authority to provide advice on tutees' conceptual skills than on language skills, they used considerable compliments and other face-saving strategies (e.g., hedging, presupposition and de-focusing of the agent) to protect both parties' face.

The present study has a dual purpose. First, we adopt conversation analysis (CA) to examine turn-by-turn interactions in order to broaden our understanding of the interactional dynamics in L2 online peer review activities. Based on preconceived categories, many previous SCMC studies investigated speech functions occurring in L2 peer review activities and shed light on what types of negotiations exist between advice givers and receivers. However, these studies underestimate the complexity of social interactions since peer review interaction can fluctuate moment by moment. Specifically, although some research analyzed data extracts, relatively few SCMC studies investigated L2 peer response from a microanalytical perspective. Therefore, we introduce a detailed analysis to explore the complexities of advice giving and receiving in L2 online peer response activities.

Second, the existing literature provides insight into peer-to-peer advice acceptance methods and mitigated accounts in a graduate writing center (Waring, 2007a, 2007b). However, to date, the nature of advice giving and receiving in the unique context of L2 computer-mediated peer response has not been fully explored. Applying a CA approach to analyze three segments of online peer response sessions from an ESL university writing class, the present study attempts to answer the research question: How do advice givers and recipients manage asymmetrical participant roles inherent in L2 peer review activities? In particular, we explore how the institutionalized nature of advice giving and receiving is accomplished in L2 SCMC contexts, while also showing how L2 speakers balance the institutional roles and maintenance of interpersonal relationships.

CA developed from an approach for the analysis of social interaction in sociology to an interdisciplinary approach in a broader range of social science

research.<sup>5</sup> L2 researchers are increasingly engaged in the analysis of L2 language classroom interactions from a CA perspective (e.g., Hall, 2004, 2007; Kasper, 2006; Koshik, 1999, 2002; Mori, 2002, 2004; Markee, 2008; Wong and Waring, 2010). This approach defines language learning not only as including linguistic forms but also as an orientation to a different semiotic system (e.g., turn-taking, repair, sequence organization, eye gaze, and embodied actions). Language learners deploy 'these intersubjective resources to co-construct with their interlocutors locally enacted, progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires in the L2' (Markee, 2008: 406). From this perspective, language learning is also considered to be a social practice. It is crucial for L2 speakers to acquire interactional patterns and behaviors in order to become competent L2 users. Thus, many L2 researchers point out the need to investigate L2 speakers' real-time language use (e.g., Mori, 2004; Markee, 2008).

This study applies the CA perspective to analyze interactive strategies and participants' behaviors emerging during advice giving and receiving interactions and to understand participants' orientation and intention toward the L2 peer review activity. As previously discussed, the major pedagogical goal of L2 peer response is to enable L2 speakers to enhance their drafts through advice from peers. Because it is concerned with L2 speakers' real-time language use, CA provides resources to explicate the interactional machinery that participants deploy to conduct the business at hand, and to reveal noticeable institutional behaviors that differ from those in daily mundane discourse.

### CA in SCMC

Most previous L2 writing studies on SCMC interactions have incorporated some qualitative analysis with excerpts of the data; however, to date, little research has analyzed SCMC from a microanalytical perspective. CA allows consideration of the interactive strategies participants employ to manage particular institutional and interactive work. In second language learning, a small but growing body of research also adopted a CA perspective to study L2 speakers' SCMC interaction (i.e., González-Lloret, 2007, 2009, 2011; Kitade, 2000; Negretti, 1999). For example, Negretti (1999) investigated interactional patterns between L1 and L2 speakers of English and explored SCMC turn-taking organization, openings, closing, turn design and use of paralinguistic features among speakers. More recently, González-Lloret (2011) investigated trouble-talk sequences (e.g., complaining or commiseration) between an L2 speaker of Spanish and an L1 language partner in SCMC contexts. González-Lloret demonstrated the potential of CA for revealing learning as the difference between the sequential patterns and linguistic resources used by the L2 speaker in early and later encounters with the L1 partner.

The current study involves two participants in each SCMC peer review activity. Two relevant CA concepts are briefly discussed below: adjacency pairs and transition-relevance places. The sequence organization in SCMC often seems disrupted and discontinuous because participants compose and post messages simultaneously (Herring, 1999). SCMC sequences, unlike face-to-face conversations, do not adhere to the time pattern of adjacency pairs (González-Lloret, 2009, 2011; Schönfeldt and Golato, 2003). Although at the first glance SCMC interaction does not involve many adjacency pairs, a closer analysis of participants' messages reveals that individual messages still orient to other messages during interactions (González-Lloret, 2007). This phenomenon in SCMC contexts is called 'virtual adjacency' (Schönfeldt and Golato, 2003: 251) in which participants read, select and respond to previous utterances.

In a traditional face-to-face sequence, interlocutors sense turn-transitional relevance places through verbal or nonverbal cues (Sacks *et al.*, 1974), and then make contingently relevant actions in the next turn, thus contributing to the typical flow of oral conversation. On the other hand, this concept of transition-relevance places does not play a role in SCMC. Each message posted on the screen is a complete unit. Participants do not have access to their interlocutor's message construction process, and therefore participants cannot monitor the conversation for turn-transitional relevance places (Schönfeldt and Golato, 2003). Thus, the participants may view each message as a turn, and each posted message is considered to be a transition-relevance place (Garcia and Jacobs, 1999).

Although some conversation analysts (i.e., Garcia and Jacobs, 1999) may be skeptical of the use of a CA approach to studying SCMC interactions since it cannot capture every nuance of what is happening during interactions (González-Lloret, 2011), CA may be beneficial for studying SCMC peer revision because CA highlights the importance of context in shaping the interactive construction of the peer review activity and in shaping participants' roles in jointly constructing meaning. More importantly, previous L1 studies adopted a conversation analytical approach to investigate interactional dynamics in SCMC contexts such as sequential organization, turn-taking systems, repair, the function of silence, negotiation of face and identity construction (Garcia and Jacobs, 1999; Golato and Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Hutchby, 2001; Rintel *et al.*, 2003; Schönfeldt and Golato, 2003; Stommel, 2008). Therefore, CA has been used as a powerful tool to uncover participant orientations toward interaction.

## Method

### Participants and setting

The excerpts in this paper are extracted from a corpus of 21 online transcripts of students' peer response activities collected in an ESL writing class at a large

American university in the spring semester of 2009. The data included 14 students from an ESL writing class. The majority of the students were L1 speakers of Arabic and Korean, although some students were from India or other Middle-Eastern countries. The students were placed in appropriate courses based on the results of a composition test administrated by the ESL program. The course lasted for 15 weeks. The three peer review activities took place in week 6, week 9, and week 14 respectively. In this course, computer-mediated peer review was adopted to supplement face-to-face interaction due to three benefits of this text-based interactive medium. First and most obviously, writing offers students more time to construct their ideas and sentences. Second, this medium has been shown to promote mutual understanding in a multilingual classroom (Liu and Sadler, 2003). Finally, the use of SCMC in peer review is believed to enhance confidence in L2 writing while increasing the quantity of peer response (Braine, 1997).

### **Data collection and procedure**

The average length of the online sessions is approximately 25 minutes. The course was based on the writing process approach, in which students participated in teacher-student conferences, peer response activities, multiple drafts and revisions. Students had three major assignments to complete, each of which went through one draft with one peer response session before final submission. In addition, a training session assisted students in identifying their foci (e.g., content, organization, rhetorical issues and language use), helping them to understand the purposes of peer review. During the training session, all students received a sample essay written by a former student and were asked to offer advice for revision. First, students discussed the essay in groups and then the instructor (one of the researchers) led a whole class discussion of students' advice on the sample manuscript.

Three peer response sessions were held during class time at a computer laboratory where each student used an individual computer. Class time was allotted for reading peers' essays and the online discussion of papers. Students worked in dyads, paired at random by the instructor. In each peer review session, every student had a paper copy of a peer review sheet and the peer's essay (see Appendix). Students reviewed their peers' essays based on the guideline of the peer review sheet, asking classmates about the thesis statement, rhetorical contexts, main ideas and development in their manuscripts. Questions in the worksheets included: 'What is the thesis of the essay?' 'Is the development of the essay complete?' 'What is the best part of the essay' and 'What part needs the most attention?' After examining peers' essays, students logged onto the web-based interface chatroom designed by a language research institute at the university. The web-based interface chatroom included two major

sections: a small *message box* in which students typed their text, and a larger *dialogue box* including the posted messages that could be seen by each dyad. Each dyad saw the dialogue box, but a student's message box appeared only on his or her monitor. A student can compose a message in a message box and then hit a button, *send*, to post the message. Every time a student sent a message, it appeared as the last line on the dialogue box and the message box became blank. The members of each dyad did not sit side by side, but instead had separate seats and used different computers. Each dyad had an individual chatroom to conduct the peer review activity. Students could save their chatroom conversations in a MS file. The documents were typically used by students as notes from the discussion and by the instructor to monitor students' progress. After each peer response session, students redrafted the final version of their essays at home and submitted them two or three days later.

We began to investigate the very first online peer review activity with unmotivated looking. Three particular episodes caught our attention because of the ways advice recipients and advice givers managed power asymmetry (i.e., when advice recipients grounded the conversations through advice-seeking requests and when advice givers offered advice with complimenting strategies). This closer investigation enabled us to identify that the advice givers tended to focus on compliments rather than advice, which is particularly problematic.

The criterion for attaining validity within a CA approach is not the frequency of cases but convincing and adequate description of particular instances (Lazaraton, 2003; Psathas, 1995; Waring, 2008). Schegloff (1987) referred to the analyses of single cases as a practice in which 'the resources of past work on a range of phenomena and organizational domains in talk-in-interaction are brought to bear on a single fragment of talk' (p. 101). Each single case is viewed as evidence that 'the machinery for its production is culturally available, involves members' competencies, and is therefore possible (and probably) producible' (Psathas, 1995: 50).

Moreover, additional instances can only provide 'another example of the method in the action, rather than securing the warrantability of the description of the machinery itself' (Benson and Hughes, 1991: 131). Waring (2009) further stated that analyzing single cases is not intended to reveal previous unknown findings but to: (a) broaden our understanding of an existing phenomenon in its extended local context (Waring, 2008, 2009); (b) create a starting point for further research (Gardner and Wagner, 2004; Hutchby and Wooffit, 2008); and (c) identify a particular aspect of actions or practices that has been unnoticed before but is important in a specific institutional context.

Our analysis proceeds as follows: We first show one excerpt which demonstrates the way participants manage advice giving and receiving in L2 SCMC

peer revision, in particular, how the advice giver and recipient orient to their institutional roles by exercising their discursive rights, and sustaining social solidarity with various interactive strategies. Additionally, the bulk of the analysis also focuses on how advice givers wield their asymmetrical power by using complimenting strategies to mitigate FTAs and to maintain interpersonal relationships. In the transcript, G refers to *advice giver* and R refers to *advice recipient*.

## Findings

### Excerpt 1

- 1 G1 12:09 pm: hE, WHAT'S UP?
- 2 R1 12:09 pm: nothing much you?
- 3 G1 12:09 pm: Okay shell we start?
- 4 R1 12:10 pm: sure, do you want to go first?
- 5 G1 12:10 pm: okay
- 6 G1 12:11 pm: I found your thesis statment very clear but
- 7 the sentence before that is confusing a little bit
- 8 G1 12:12 pm: Are you gonna right about the solutions for
- 9 that problem?
- 10 G1 12:12 pm: I mean in the second part?
- 11 R1 12:12 pm: **Yes, I just wrote the cuasation this time**
- 12 G1 12:12 pm: wrigh\*
- 13 G1 12:12 pm: wright\*
- 14 G1 12:13 pm: okay now it's clear
- 15 R1 12:13 pm: **I meant to state the serious situation of**
- 16 **poverty becuase many people really don't know how**
- 17 **serious it is**
- 18 G1 12:14 pm: the topic sentence in all of your paragraph
- 19 are clear and strong except for last one
- 20 G1 12:14 pm: the one about infant mortality
- 21 R1 12:14 pm: **Actually I do agree too**
- 22 G1 12:14 pm: lets talk about the last paragraph later
- 23 R1 12:15 pm: **why not**
- 24 R1 12:15 pm: **what's next**
- 25 G1 12:15 pm: You used a lot of transtion words which is

26           very important for the structure of your essay

27    R1    12:16 pm: **Do you think I should provided more facts?**

28    R1    12:16 pm: **like statistical facts.**

29    R1    12:16 pm: **I meant provide.**

30    G1    12:16 pm: Yes actually I wanted to talk to you about

31           it

32    G1    12:17 pm: You used a lot of good quotation

33    G1    12:17 pm: the thing is I didn't really get emotional

34           which mey effevt the logos of your essay

35    G1    12:18 pm: You may use more statictstic about the death

36           rate of kids in these poor countries

37    R1    12:18 pm: **you mean pathos?**

38    G1    12:18 pm: yeah sorry

39    R1    12:18 pm: **For the last paragraph, I think I was trying**

40           **to show how the increase of population of the poor**

41    R1    12:18 pm: **but they have no way to continue their lives**

42           **so they die**

43    R1    12:19 pm: **so will it be better to show the death rate**

44           **in the last paragraph?**

45    G1    12:19 pm: As well you could talk about how kids could

46           live foe days without any food to make the reader get

47           emotional

48    R1    12:19 pm: **oh good one :)**

In excerpt 1<sup>6</sup> below the G1 systematically uses compliments to introduce criticism or advice (lines 6–7, 18–20, 32–34). This complimenting strategy can soften the force of FTAs by putting forward positive, face-enhancing information as well as setting up a favorable context for a specific FTA to come (Johnson, 1992). On the other hand, the R1 uses straightforward agreement to the criticism to show regard for the G1's positive face.

The G1 indicates to the R1 where the trouble source is by first complimenting what the R1 has done well with the thesis statement, and then proceeds to identify the issues that he considers to be problematic in lines 6–10.<sup>7</sup> To the G1's confirmation check, the R1's response is an affirmative statement, 'Yes, I just wrote the cuasation this time,'<sup>8</sup> has been acknowledged by the G1 in line 14, followed by 'I meant to state the serious situation of poverty because many people really don't know how serious it is,' an assertion that further elaborates on the R1's position. In addition to providing criticism and advice, the

advice giver also can wield his or her power to initiate an issue to be discussed (Waring, 2005, 2007b). The G1 raises a new topic by identifying a trouble source in lines 18–20. Meanwhile, the G1 employs a similar complimenting strategy here; that is, the G1 puts forward complementing discourse first, and then makes a negative assessment on the R1's last paragraph.

The R1 uses the straightforward agreement of, 'Actually I do agree too,' in responding to the G1's negative evaluation. This agreement not only implies that the R1 confirms the last paragraph could be problematic, but also indicates that the R1 is positioned as a co-assessor of the essay, who has similar opinions to those of the G1 (Waring, 2007a). Even if the R1's utterance, 'why not,' in line 23 signifies that she looks forward to a discussion of the last paragraph, 'what's next' immediately afterward displays her recognition of the G1's intention to discuss other parts of the manuscript first.

Subsequently, it seems that the G1 tries to preface the identification of another trouble source with complimenting discourse in lines 25–26, but his attempt is forestalled by the R1, who cuts in before the G1 starts his next turn, launching another advice-seeking inquiry. The question (lines 27–28) displays the R1's intent to seek further advice for handling the trouble source. On the surface, this question looks like a general inquiry about the overall essay. However, it in fact works as a prelude to the solution for the last paragraph. First, establishing the G1's advice to use more statistical facts allows a follow-up inquiry (lines 43–44) as to whether the R1 shows the death rate in the last paragraph. Second, when this occurs, it allows the R1 not to violate the G1's intention to postpone the discussion of the last paragraph by generating a general inquiry, but remains in keeping with her own agenda – looking for advice for the last paragraph.

The G1's response, 'Yes actually I wanted to talk to you about it,' implies that he is ready to proffer helpful advice, meanwhile indicating a sense that the G1 and the R1 shares similar views. This action indicates that the G1 orients himself to the institutional role of a speaker well-equipped to offer advice on the R1's manuscript. Moreover, the G1 first offers a compliment in line 32 and then points out another trouble source – the R1's essay does not include enough logos to invoke readers' emotions in line 33–34. The R1 corrects the G1's error to pathos. This displays the R1's expertise and constitutes herself as an expert in essay construction. The G1 proceeds to suggest 'You may use more statistic about the death rate of kids in these poor countries' which adopts the R1's candidate suggestion in her advice-inquiry questions in lines 27–28. Since the G1's advice corresponds to the R1's proposed solution that the use of statistic evidence (i.e., death rates) to support her arguments of infant mortality, the R1 goes further to allude to her own deliberations about the last paragraph and proposes another candidate solution, 'so will it be better to show

the death rate in the last paragraph?’, to be accepted or rejected by the G1. The G1’s response in lines 45–47 is advice for the lack of pathos in the R1’s essay. In the R1’s response, ‘oh’ treats the advice as news and then appends it with a positive assessment.

This analysis shows that the G1 and the R1 are highly sensitive to advice delivery and reception in the peer response session. Both participants intend to adopt their institutional roles; however, at the same time, they employ a range of face-saving actions. The G1 employs a complimenting strategy to mitigate FTAs and to maintain interpersonal relationships. However, it is very striking to see the lack of the R1’s response to the G1’s compliments. In lines 27–29, the R1 launches an advice inquiry without issuing any response to the G1’s compliments (lines 25–26).<sup>9</sup> Advice seeking is advice recipients’ legitimate business. Seeking advice actively is viewed as a part of advice recipients’ tasks (Vehviläinen, 2009). Thus, it seems that it does not pose a problem for either party. However, the lack of the compliment response (e.g., thanks) implies that the R1 may treat the G1’s compliments as unnecessary. In addition to complimenting discourse, the G1 hedges his advice with ‘you may,’ and ‘you could,’ (lines 35 and 45) to mitigate the force of advice, suggesting that the R1 has the choice of whether or not to accept the advice. This is also in line with Stewart’s (2004) study where the advice givers tended to protect both parties’ faces by using more hedging devices when they provided advice on conceptual skills than on language skills.

## Excerpt 2

26	R2	11:12 pm: any points u did not understand?
27	G2	11:12 pm: i cannot identify the thesis in the INTRO
28	G2	11:12 pm: nono
29	G2	11:12 pm: your points were
30	G2	11:12 pm: very clear
31	G2	11:12 pm: and I very much liked your ideas that are
32		mostly different from others
33	G2	11:12 pm: and your wording choices were great
34	G2	11:13 pm: I could never think of those vocabularies
35	R2	11:13 pm:
36	R2	11:13 pm: dictionary helps a lot!!
37	R2	11:13 pm:
38	G2	11:13 pm: that was pretty much it. you had just little
39		spelling error
40	G2	11:13 pm: and your ideas were very clear
41	R2	11:14 pm: so, no thesis in intro

42 G2 11:14 pm: yeah  
 43 R2 11:14 pm: could u find it anywhere else?  
 44 G2 11:14 pm: well  
 45 G2 11:15 pm: i see your opinion in the last part and  
 46 G2 11:15 pm: strong ideas throughout body paragraphs  
 47 though  
 48 R2 11:15 pm: ok  
 49 G2 11:15 pm: except that  
 50 R2 11:15 pm: what about conclusion?  
 51 G2 11:16 pm: perfect!!!  
 52 G2 11:16 pm: conclusion was good showing your opinions  
 53 R2 11:16 pm: one more question  
 54 G2 11:16 pm: okay  
 55 R2 11:17 pm: i dont remember hom many body paragraphs i  
 56 have, but were they seperate enough

Excerpt 2 demonstrates that the G2 attempts to balance offering critical advice with maintaining a harmonious interpersonal relationship. Specifically, the G2 avoids providing critical advice and issues the use of compliments to mitigate specific FTAs. However, instead of addressing advice delivery, this complimenting behavior seems to render the negative evaluations confusing and leave the whole advice sequence ambiguous. First of all, the R2 initiates an advice-giving sequence. The G2 indicates to the R2 where the trouble source is by pointing to the specific section of the manuscript – the thesis statement is missing in the introduction, which implies that the G2 might not find any sentence that includes the central idea of the essay in the first paragraph. The G2 assumes that the thesis statement should appear in the introduction. Therefore, this trouble source might prompt forthcoming advice. However, instead of addressing advice delivery, the G2 immediately calls for the use of complimenting strategies to redress this critical comment. ‘nono’ followed by ‘your points were very clear’ in lines 28–30 indicates that the G2’s previous criticism of missing a thesis statement in the introduction could be just a slip and could create the discrepancy. Furthermore, the G2 employs a significant amount of complimenting discourse in lines 31–40. She compliments the R2’s clear presentation of his statement, new ideas and great word choice. It seems that the G2 tries to close the topic by launching ‘that was pretty much it; you had just little spelling error,’ followed by another mitigation ‘and your ideas were very clear.’

Since the G2’s compliments in lines 28–30 does not concur with the initial comment, this discrepancy seems to pose trouble for the R2, who initiates a repair to ensure whether or not the thesis statement exists in the first paragraph. To the R2’s confirmation question, the G2’s response is an affirmative

'yeah,' thus implying that the thesis statement indeed cannot be found in the introduction, which confirms the original criticism. It is very interesting to note that the G2 could have offered advice right after a negative comment in line 28. However, the G2 indicates that the R2's ideas have been presented very clearly (lines 29–30 and line 40). It seems that the R2 is likely to avoid providing advice because it could have threatened the G2's negative face; at the same time, the compliments help mitigate the critical comments (lines 27 and 38–39) by addressing the R2's positive image.

On the other hand, from a rhetorical perspective, the thesis statement can be either presented in the introductory paragraph or another paragraph. Thus, the R2 then poses a question in line 43, where he says 'could u find it anywhere else?' assuming that it is possible that the thesis statement appears elsewhere in the manuscript. The G2 precedes her answer with 'well,' signifying that she shares the same assumption that the main point of the essay can be recognized in another paragraph with the R2.

If the G2 had meant that the thesis statement should be presented in the introduction, she would have pursued her argument right after line 45. This would indicate that the R2 might need to put forward the thesis in the first paragraph even though the G2 can find the thesis statement in the last paragraph. Instead of delivering the advice, the G2 issues a compliment in line 46–47. This complimenting behavior leaves the advice sequence ambiguous. That is, this advice sequence could have been concluded by an assertion of advice (e.g. the essay needs to include a thesis statement in the first paragraph). However, the G2 seems to avoid providing critical advice in favor of complimenting. Thus, we can see that the G2 may attempt to balance critical advice with maintaining interpersonal relationships when she is reluctant to advise that some corrections need to be made to the R2's essay in the first place (line 28) and here as well.

In line 49, the G2 seems to want to raise a new topic, but her action is forestalled by the R2, who cuts in to inquire about the conclusion. The G2 makes a positive assessment on the conclusion, indicating that the R2 presents his opinions well. Following the G2's acknowledgement token in line 54, the R2 then launches another question. Those questions demonstrate that the R2 effectively grounds the flow of the conversation according to his own agenda.

Peer response requires that the advice givers meet the interpersonal and ideational expectations of the recipients. In the peer review process, the advice giver can be momentarily constituted as the more competent person, who needs to deal with this temporarily enhanced power. It is crucial for the advice giver to wield his or her power and also to sustain social harmony. For example, in excerpt 2, 'and your wording choices were great I could never think of those vocabularies' in lines 33 and 34 indicates that the G2 uses this

complimenting strategy to humble herself and make herself less powerful and authoritative. Doing so can eliminate the temporary asymmetries of power between the parties, and also assists the G2 in building or maintaining solidarity with the R2.

It is also interesting to note how the R2 responds to the G2's compliments. For example, in line 36, the R2 responds to one of the G2's compliments, saying that 'dictionary helps a lot!!' to downgrade the compliment of the R2's lexicon choices. Furthermore, the G2 provides another positive comment in line 40, and the R2 initiates a repair to an original criticism. However, the lack of the R2's second-pair part (e.g. thanks) to complete a compliment sequence may imply that the R2 is likely to treat the G2's compliments as unnecessary. At the same time, the initiation of the repair on a trouble source also indicates the R2's needs to seek advice for improvement, which is in line with the similar episode (lines 25–29) in excerpt 1.

### Excerpt 3

- |    |    |  |
|----|----|--|
| 41 | R3 | 12:19 pm: then about me                                |
| 42 | G3 | 12:20 pm: ok   |
| 43 | R3 | 12:20 pm: point the hundred mistake i made             |
| 44 | G3 | 12:20 pm: i thought your essay was overall pretty good |
| 45 | R3 | 12:20 pm: what   |
| 46 | G3 | 12:20 pm: well yeah, i did find some grammar mistakes  |
| 47 |    | and such   |
| 48 | R3 | 12:20 pm: ok   |
| 49 | G3 | 12:20 pm: but i think its not really the mistakes in   |
| 50 |    | grammar that your supposed to worry about              |
| 51 | G3 | 12:21 pm: its the structure and the the idea that your |
| 52 |    | trying to convey                                       |
| 53 | G3 | 12:21 pm: and to me I think you did all that           |
| 54 | G3 | 12:21 pm: you put up some good causes and good         |
| 55 |    | evidence to support it in all of your paragraphs       |
| 56 | R3 | 12:21 pm: tell the bad part                            |
| 57 | G3 | 12:22 pm: i dont really think there is a bad part      |
| 58 | G3 | 12:22 pm: you did really good                          |
| 59 | R3 | 12:22 pm: come on                                      |
| 60 | G3 | 12:22 pm: but regarding the grammar mistakes           |
| 61 | G3 | 12:22 pm: if you would have written with good grammar  |
| 62 |    | it would have been perfect                             |
| 63 | G3 | 12:22 pm: i think                                      |
| 64 | R3 | 12:23 pm: sure i will change that                      |

Excerpt 3 also demonstrates that initiating advice-querying questions reflects the R3's intent and his anticipation toward the peer review activity, indicating that the R3 seeks useful advice for revision rather than receiving positive comments. Meanwhile, the complimenting strategy that the G3 employs raises dilemmas for both parties.

The most noticeable aspect in this excerpt is that the R3 immediately encourages the G3 to identify the weakness of his essay in line 43, once the G3 starts his turn for providing advice to the R3. However, in the second pair part, the G3 proffers a positive assessment 'i thought your essay was overall pretty good,' which is perceived as an unpreferred response by the R3. Therefore, a clarification token 'what' follows the assessment, which implicitly indicates that the R3 seeks advice rather than compliments. In response, the G3 prefaces his answer with a discourse marker, 'well,' indicating that the G3 is going to proceed with a reconstructed statement that is counter to his previous utterance and 'yeah' in succession can be considered to be an agreement token, implying that the G3 agrees with the R3 that some parts of his manuscript needs to be revised. In the middle of line 46–47, 'I did find some grammar mistakes and such,' displays the G3's orientation to the institutional role of the advice giver who is indeed capable of identifying a trouble source and then provides advice for improving the R3's manuscript. On the other hand, the G3 has also inferred the R3's intention to seek advice. Therefore, the G3 offers a critical comment on grammar that matches the R3's anticipation. The R3 acknowledges the criticism with 'ok.' The negative comment might prompt a forthcoming advice (e.g., you should change it). Instead of addressing advice delivery, the G3 proceeds to mitigate this critical evaluation by starting a compliment sequence. First, the G3 indicates that the R3 does not need to worry about the grammatical errors, which does not correspond to the original criticism in lines 49–50. Subsequently, the G3 states that what the R3 needs to focus on is the structure of the essay and the ideas included instead. However, the G3 offers a compliment followed by an account to indicate that the R3 has indeed done well on those rhetorical issues in lines 54–55. It is very interesting to note that this complimenting sequence is not only designed to remedy a specific FTA (line 46–47), but also to address the R3's positive face. That is, the G3 first switches the discussion topic from grammatical problems to rhetorical issues. This remedies the FTA by downgrading the seriousness of the grammatical problems. Furthermore, the compliment about what the R3 has done well on rhetorical issues provides credits to the R3, which addresses his positive self-image. However, this complimenting behavior makes the original negative comment on grammar seem to be a slip.

The R3's assertion 'tell the bad part' in line 56 reinforces his anticipation towards the G3 and to shows the irrelevance of the G3's compliment in the

context. Negative comments, rather than compliments, may be considered to be more helpful to the R3 in improving his essay. The G3's response in line 57 implies a positive assessment of the R3's manuscript. Furthermore, the G3 upgrades this assessment by saying 'really good.' However, 'come on' in line 59 signifies the occurrence of negative evaluation that is expected by the R3 during the interaction. The G3 seems to back off and raises the issue of grammatical errors again in line 60, and then provide advice in lines 61–63. Then the R3 accepts the advice.

In excerpts 2 and 3, it seems that the G2 and G3 experience challenges when advising that corrections need to be made to their peers' essays. The G2 could have provided advice by stating that the introduction should include a thesis statement. Likewise, the G3 could have advised that the R3 needs to double check grammar in the first place (e.g. line 49). However, both advice givers avoid offering advice in favor of complimenting, since advice can damage a harmonious relationship by threatening the recipients' negative faces. In other words, the G2's and G3's difficulties are inherent in balancing the role for delivery of advice with the maintenance of an interpersonal relationship with advice recipients. Therefore, in the process of peer response, the G2 and the G3 might tend to provide compliments on their peer's essay right after the negative evaluations. However, this conflicts with the recipient's intent for peer review activities. For example, in this excerpt, the R3 subsequently makes explicit claims or advice requests for the G3 in lines 43, 45, 56 and 59. And the G3 can infer the R3's intention for advice and indicates the grammatical problems. More specifically, the G3's straightforward negative comment in line 46 can be considered to be intent to meet the R3's expectations. However, the G3 tends to employ face-saving strategies to mitigate face-threatening comments and to sustain solidarity with the R3 rather than addressing advice delivery. Under these circumstances, the conflicting behavior between the advice recipient and advice giver occurs.

## Discussion and conclusion

The analysis showed how L2 users managed this institutional activity by invoking their discursive rights; that is, these advice recipients oriented to the peer review activity by initiating advice-seeking requests, while these advice givers adopted their institutional role by evaluating or providing advice on the recipients' manuscript. However, doing advising contributes to FTAs, which can threaten the recipients' positive or negative face. The advice givers employed complimenting discourses to eliminate specific FTAs and to maintain interpersonal relationships.

L2 peer review is meant both to assist advice recipients for essay revision and to allow advice givers to examine manuscripts and provide evaluation.

However, having to offer negative evaluation and counsel while also maintaining solidarity constitutes a dilemma. Negative evaluations might threaten the recipient's positive face while suggestions for improvement may threaten negative face. Thus, it is understandable that the G2 and the G3 in peer response experienced difficulties when offering advice. The G2 and G3 showed regard for the needs of both the advice recipients' negative and positive faces, even in cases when it was the R2 and R3 who solicited the advice. More specifically, the G2 avoided providing critical advice and immediately generated the use of compliments to mitigate FTAs right after criticisms. However, instead of addressing advice delivery, this complimenting behavior seemed to render the negative evaluations confusing and leave the whole advice sequence ambiguous. Likewise, the G3 also immediately offered the use of compliments right after the negative comments to mitigate the FTAs and emphasize the R3's positive-image, rather than addressing advice delivery. This complimenting strategy caused dilemmas since the advice inquires reflected the R3's expectation toward the advice giver, indicating that the R3 sought useful advice from the G3.

We suspect that the dilemma of balancing criticism with the maintenance of social solidarity may be prevalent among advice givers in various uses of computer-mediated peer response, including regular L2 university classrooms and online courses. Conscientious advice givers must attempt to accomplish these institutional tasks in a way that is critical and insightful, yet sensitive to the face needs of their interlocutor. Some advice givers may accord more significance to interpersonal relationships than to the actual task at hand. Paradoxically, this preference can lead to conflict, as in the case of R3, whose requests for advice were downplayed by G3's preference to issue compliments.

Regarding face-to-face peer review activities, Liu and Hansen (2002) suggested that instruction on hedging devices might be incorporated into curricula in order to help L2 speakers soften criticism, a suggestion supported by the findings of this study in the case of SCMC. L2 educators can expand L2 speakers' interactional resources by helping them to develop ways to manage advice-giving, using hedging devices to mitigate face-threatening advice giving, and teaching them when and how these devices can be most effectively and strategically used in SCMC peer review sessions. For example, Waring's (2007b) study demonstrated how tutors used accounts to achieve face-saving purposes. Accounts can allow participants to infer solutions together and mitigate the face-threatening aspects of advice giving. Along these lines, integrating knowledge of face-saving strategies into the training sessions for peer response in L2 curricula can help L2 speakers develop an understanding of how advice giving and politeness can be combined.

As was the case in Vehviläinen's (2009) study, advice requests are treated as legitimate and routinely-done activities in this peer revision activity. Although asymmetrical relationships exist between parties in this activity, advice recipients can overcome this power asymmetry by shaping the conversations according to their own agendas through advice-seeking questions. However, R1, R2, and R3 seemed to display ignorance of the advice givers' compliments without launching second-pair parts in several instances, which may be viewed as a dispreferred action (Golato, 2005; Pomerantz, 1978). Although the recipients showed regard for their interlocutors' face in many aspects (e.g., respecting the advice givers' authority to provide advice, agreeing on negative evaluations, or accepting advice), they may not be aware of the interactional delicacy required when exercising their legitimate rights. Therefore, we suggest that the knowledge of preferred responses to advice givers' compliments be incorporated into training sessions to help enhance L2 speakers' awareness of the interactional delicacy of the activity and to facilitate L2 speakers' more effective engagement in SCMC peer response.

Previous SCMC L2 research sheds light on the types of negotiations and functions occurring in L2 peer review activities based on preformed or preconceived categories. These category systems may structure observations and produce results corresponding to their formulations, 'thereby obscuring or distorting the features of interactional phenomena' (Psathas, 1995: 8). The conversation analysis approach reveals the significance of the L2 speakers' concerns about the maintenance of interpersonal relationship during the peer revision task. Specifically, the investigation of SCMC L2 peer revision from a CA perspective exposes the intertwined dimensions of institutional power and social relationships, which otherwise may go unanalyzed.

CA is a powerful approach allowing the researchers to microanalyze the current data by 'attending to the minute details of the interactional conduct' (Kasper, 2004: 564). In other words, the microanalysis – investigating SCMC interaction turn-by-turn – was complete within these three excerpts. In addition, although CA does not impose interpretations external to the data, once the analysis is completed, we can still draw practical implications to improve the type of institutional discourse examined. As ten Have (1999) suggested, 'rather than providing packaged easy-to-use solutions to felt problems, CA might only be helpful in terms of developing an overall sensitivity' for the intricacies of interaction (p. 200). Thus, applying a CA approach prompts not only greater sensitivity to advice giving and receiving in L2 peer revision but also a deeper understanding of interactions occurring in computer-mediated contexts.

In conclusion, this preliminary study illustrated the precise nature of peer review activities involving advice giving and receiving. The study might

constitute a point of departure for collecting cases where L2 speakers manage institutional roles and social relationships during in peer response across various contexts. Additionally, further research can be conducted in other areas of L2 peer revision activities. For example, how would enhanced training sessions, including specific guidelines for advice giving and receiving, influence the interactive outcome of the peer review task? It is hoped that this conversation analytic study will contribute to pedagogical insights and to the design of peer review activities in the L2 classroom.

## Appendix

### Peer Review Sheet<sup>10</sup>

Writer \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Read your partner's essay carefully and use the following questions to help you give suggestions to your peer:

1. What is the thesis of the essay? State it in your own words by completing the following statement: The main point of the essay is that:
2. Is the thesis clear and sufficiently narrowed down?
3. Do you have any suggestions about the introduction or the thesis?
4. What is the principle of organization for the essay? Is it effective? Suggestions on organization:
5. Has the writer used transitions and key words to give variety and coherence?
6. How about word choice? Does the writer use precise words to express his or her
7. opinions?
8. Does the first developmental paragraph support the thesis?
9. What kind of evidence is used to support the thesis – facts, personal experiences, quotes? (How do they correspond to logos, ethos, pathos?)
10. Do you have any suggestions about the first developmental paragraph?
11. Answer questions 7, 8 and 9 about the remaining developmental paragraphs.
12. Is the development of the essay complete?
13. Is the conclusion logical? Is it interesting? Do you have any suggestions about the conclusion?
14. What is the best part of the essay?
15. What part needs the most attention?

## Notes

1. The 'micro-level' refers to a microanalytical perspective that is a conversation analysis approach to the SCMC data. This approach can help the researchers discover the more fine-grained details of L2 speakers' SCMC interactions (Gonzalez-Lloret, 2011).
2. The nature of advising contributes to asymmetrical relationships between advice givers and recipients (Hutchby, 1995). In the case of L2 peer response, we do not indicate that one participant has higher language proficiency than another. Rather the institutional role at the moment of interaction constitutes the advice giver as the more knowledgeable party. Therefore, advice givers can exercise their institutional power by offering critique and suggestions.
3. We do not intend to generalize the L2 peer response task. Rather, our attempt here is to point out some features that can distinguish L2 peer review interactions from everyday conversations.
4. In peer revision-related interaction, Waring (2005) stated that questions may be considered to be conducive and advisory. Similar inferential frameworks and procedures may also operate in L2 peer review activities.
5. The CA approach is applied to study institutional interactions and practices, and differs from other approaches to qualitative research in consideration of *context*. That is, CA can be considered *context-free*. CA researchers do not generally depend on ethnographic knowledge, but start with micro-analysis of the specific way in which participants contribute to an ongoing conversation (Sacks *et al.*, 1974). However, the CA approach is *context-specific*. The analysis of institutional interaction may require contextual knowledge in order to understand the aspects that distinguish it from ordinary conversations (Sacks *et al.*, 1974).
6. The words in bold font were produced by the student. The website interface chatroom offered typographical functions by which students could change the style of letters such as colors, boldness, or sizes. One of the reviewers indicated that we did not include other typographical features in excerpts. Since students saved their conversation in MS files, many typographical functions did not show in word documents.
7. We use terminology from CA studies of conversational trouble sources (Sacks *et al.*, 1974). However, we are not concerned with trouble sources as defined as potential troubles of speaking, hearing and understanding in conversation (Garfinkel, 1967; Sacks *et al.*, 1974). We are concerned with the problematic text of the written language that may initiate the process of advising.
8. The participant's message was reproduced exactly, as were all messages quoted in the paper. Students usually posted messages without rectifying typographical errors.
9. It is possible that the R1 and the G1 constructed their messages simultaneously among lines 24–27. Nevertheless, the R1 would still been able to launch a second-pair part to respond to the G1's compliment in the following turns (after line 27) since each turn is considered to be a transition-relevance place in SCMC contexts (e.g., González-Lloret, 2011).
10. The peer review sheet was a teaching material developed cooperatively by L2 writing teachers at the ESL program.

## Acknowledgment

We greatly appreciate the anonymous reviewers for their valuable and insightful comments. We are also very grateful to the Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research (CALPER) for technology support. We also thank our colleagues and friends at the Pennsylvania State University, particularly Wei-Fan Chen, Chung-Pei Chuang, Yunfeng Shi, Houxiang Li, Yumi Matsumoto and Anni Chang.

## About the authors

Mei-Hsing Tsai has recently received her Ph.D. from the Pennsylvania State University and teaches L2 writing courses at National Tsing Hua University in Taiwan. Her research interests include sociocultural theory, computer-mediated communication, peer interaction and cognitive linguistics.

Celeste Kinginger is Professor of Applied Linguistics and French at the Pennsylvania State University, where she is involved in the education of language teachers and researchers in language education. She is the author or editor of several book-length projects on language learning in study abroad as well as numerous articles on sociocultural aspects of technology-enhanced foreign language learning.

## References

- Beauvois, M. H. (1992). Computer-assisted classroom discussion in the foreign language classroom: Conversation in slow motion. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25 (5): 455–464. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1992.tb01128.x>
- Beauvois, M. H. (1998). Conversation in slow motion: Computer-mediated communication in the foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54 (2): 198–217. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.54.2.198>
- Benson, D. and Hughes, J. (1991). Method, evidence and inference: Evidence and inference for ethnomethodology. In G. Button (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*, 109–136. New York: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611827.007>
- Blake, R. (2000). Computer mediated communication: A window on L2 Spanish interlanguage. *Language Learning & Technology*, 4 (1): 120–136. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol4num1/blake/default.html>
- Braine, G. (1997). Beyond word processing: Networked computers in ESL writing classes. *Computers and Composition*, 14 (1): 45–58. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S8755-4615\(97\)90037-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S8755-4615(97)90037-2)
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapelle, C. (2001). *Computer Applications in Second Language Acquisition: Foundations for Teaching, Testing, and Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524681>
- Chun, D. (1994). Using computer network to facilitate the acquisition of interactive competence. *System*, 22 (1): 17–31. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(94\)90037-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(94)90037-X)
- DiGiovanni, E. and Nagaswami, G. (2001). Online peer review: An alternative to face-to-face? *ELT Journal*, 55 (3): 263–272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.3.263>
- Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (Eds). (1992). *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Fitze, M. (2006). Discourse and participation in ESL face-to-face and written electronic conferences. *Language Learning & Technology*, 10 (1): 67–86. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol10num1/fitze/default.html>
- Frankel, R. (1990). Talking in interviews: A dispreference for patient-initiated questions in physician-patient encounters. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interaction Competence*, 231–262. Washington DC: University Press of America.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Garcia, A. C. and Jacobs, J. B. (1999). The eyes of the beholder: Understanding the turn-taking system in quasi-synchronous computer-mediated communication. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32 (4): 337–367. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327973rls3204\\_2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327973rls3204_2)
- Gardner, R. and Wagner, J. (2004). Introduction. In R. Gardner and J. Wagner (Eds), *Second Language Conversations*, 1–17. London: Continuum.
- Golato, A. (2005). *Compliments and Compliments Responses: Grammatical Structures and Sequential Organization*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sidag.15>
- Golato, A. and Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). Negotiation of face in web chats. *Multilingua*, 25 (3): 293–322. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/MULTI.2006.017>
- González-Lloret, M. (2007). What do language learners attend to when their environment changes? In C. Perrián (Ed.), *Revisiting Language Learning Resources*, 223–242. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- González-Lloret, M. (2009). CA for computer-mediated interaction in the Spanish L2 classroom. In G. Kasper and H. Nguyen (Eds), *Conversation Analytic Studies of L1 and L2 Interaction, Learning, and Education*, 281–316. Honolulu, HI: NFLRC and University of Hawaii Press.
- González-Lloret, M. (2011). Conversation analysis of computer-mediated communication. *CALICO Journal*, 28 (2): 308–325. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11139/cj.28.2.308-325>
- Goodwin, C. and Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19: 283–307. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.19.100190.001435>
- Hall, J. K. (2004). Language learning as an interactional achievement. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4): 607–611.
- Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91 (4): 511–526. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00619.x>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd edn). London: Edward Arnold.
- Heath, C. (1992). The delivery and reception of diagnosis in the general practice consultation. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (Eds), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, 235–267. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Heritage, J. and Sefi, S. (1992). Dilemmas of advice: Aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between health visitors and first-time mothers. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (Eds), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, 359–417. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Herring, S. (1999). Interactional coherence in CMC. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 4 (4). Retrieved from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol4/issue4/herring.html>
- Hutchby, I. (1995). Aspects of recipient design in expert advice-giving on call-in radio. *Discourse Processes*, 19 (2): 219–238. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01638539509544915>
- Hutchby, I. (2001). *Conversation and Technology: From the Telephone to the Internet*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffit, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis* (2nd edn). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Johnson, D. M. (1992). Compliments and politeness in peer-review texts. *Applied Linguistics*, 13 (1): 51–71. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/13.1.51>
- Jones, R. H., Garralda, A., Li, D. C. S. and Lock, G. (2006). Interactional dynamics in on-line and face-to-face peer-tutoring sessions for second language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15 (1): 1–23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.12.001>
- Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4): 551–567. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-18-.x>
- Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, 19: 83–99. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.07kas>
- Kelm, O. R. (1992). The use of synchronous computer networks in second language Instruction: A preliminary report. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25 (5): 441–454. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1992.tb01127.x>
- Kern, R. (1995). Restructuring classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects on quantity and characteristics of language production. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79 (4): 457–476. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb05445.x>
- Kinginger, C. (2000). Learning the pragmatics of solidarity in the networked foreign language classroom. In J. K. Hall and L. S. Verplaetse (Eds), *Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction*, 23–46. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kitade, K. (2000). L2 learners' discourse and SLA theories in CMC: Collaborative interaction in internet chat. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 13 (2): 143–166. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1076/0958-8221\(200004\)13:2;1-D;FT143](http://dx.doi.org/10.1076/0958-8221(200004)13:2;1-D;FT143)
- Koshik, I. (1999). Practices of pedagogy in ESL writing conferences: A conversation analytic study of turns and sequences that assist student revision. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35 (3): 277–309. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3503\\_2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3503_2)

- Lazaraton, A. (2003). Evaluative criteria for qualitative research in applied linguistics: Whose criteria and whose research? *The Modern Language Journal*, 87 (1): 1–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00175>
- Liang, M-Y. (2010). Using synchronous online peer response groups in EFL writing: Revision-related discourse. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14 (1): 45–64. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol14num1/liang.pdf>
- Liu, J. and Hansen, J. (2002). *Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Liu, J. and Sadler, R. W. (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes on L2 writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2 (3): 193–227. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585\(03\)00025-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00025-0)
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29 (3): 404–427. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm052>
- Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 23 (3): 323–347. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.3.323>
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4): 536–550. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-17-x>
- Morrow, P. R. (2006). Telling about problems and giving advice in an Internet discussion forum: Some discourse features. *Discourse Studies*, 8 (4): 531–548. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1461445606061876>
- Negretti, R. (1999). Web-based activities and SLA: A conversation analysis research approach. *Language Learning & Technology*, 3 (1): 75–87. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol3num1/negretti/index.html>
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, 79–112. New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-623550-0.50010-0>
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds), *Structures of Social Action*, 57–101. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pudlinski, C. (2002). Accepting and rejecting advice as competent peers: Caller dilemmas on a warm line. *Discourse Studies*, 4 (4): 481–500. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1461445602004004026>
- Rintel, E. S., Pittam, J. and Mulholland, J. (2003). Time will tell: Ambiguous non-responses on internet relay chat. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 13 (1): 1–18. Retrieved from [http://www.cios.org/getfile/rintel\\_v13n1](http://www.cios.org/getfile/rintel_v13n1)

- Sacks, H. E., Schegloff, E., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language*, 50: 696–735. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/412243>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50 (2): 101–114. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2786745>
- Schönfeldt, J. and Golato, A. (2003). Repair in chats: A conversation analytic approach. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36 (3): 241–284. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3603\\_02](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3603_02)
- Simpson, J. (2005). Conversational floors in synchronous text-based CMC discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7 (3): 337–361. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1461445605052190>
- Smith, B. (2003). Computer-mediated negotiated interaction: An expanded model. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87 (1): 38–57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00177>
- Sotillo, S. (2000). Discourse functions and syntactic complexity in synchronous and asynchronous communication. *Language Learning & Technology*, 4 (1): 82–119. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol4num1/sotillo/default.html>
- Stewart, M. (2004). Written pedagogic feedback and linguistic politeness. In R. M. Reiter and M. E. Placencia (Eds), *Current Trends in the Pragmatics of Spanish*, 99–120. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/pbns.123.11ste>
- Stommel, W. (2008). Conversation analysis and community of practice as approaches to studying online community. *Language@Internet*, 5. Retrieved from <http://www.languageatinternet.de/articles/2008/1537>
- ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Vásquez, C. (2004). Very carefully managed: Advice and suggestions in post-observation meetings. *Linguistics and Education*, 15 (1–2): 33–58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2004.10.004>
- Vehviläinen, S. (2009). Student-initiated advice in academic supervision. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42 (2): 163–190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08351810902864560>
- Waring, H. Z. (2005). Peer tutoring in a graduate writing center: Identity, expertise and advice resisting. *Applied Linguistics*, 26 (2): 141–168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amh041>
- Waring, H. Z. (2007a). Complex advice acceptance as a resource for managing asymmetries. *Text and Talk*, 27 (1): 107–137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2007.005>
- Waring, H. Z. (2007b). The multi-functionality of accounts in advice giving. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11 (3): 367–391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00328.x>
- Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92 (4): 577–594. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00788.x>
- Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (initiation-response-feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning*, 59 (4): 796–824. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00526.x>

Warschauer, M. (1996). Comparing face-to-face and electronic discussion in the second language classroom. *CALICO Journal*, 13 (2-3): 7-26.

Wong, J. and Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: A Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers*. New York: Routledge.